

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 25 are pending in this application. Claims 1 is amended in several particulars for purposes of clarity in accordance with current Office policy, to assist the examiner and to expedite compact prosecution of this application. Claims 24 and 25 have been newly added. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication of allowability concerning claims 11 through 23.

I. Specification

The Examiner stated that the title of the invention is not descriptive and that a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The title has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

II. CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

No claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) unless all of the elements are found in exactly the same situation and united in the same way in a single prior art reference. As mentioned in the **MPEP §2131**, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Every

element must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (CAFC 1989). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim. *Id.*, “All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art.” *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970), and MPEP 2143.03.

1. As to claim 1, the Examiner stated that Kakigi teaches a system controlling a printing device, comprising:

- the printing device (102 in fig. 1) including a plurality of sheet storage unit (107 in fig. 1) storing sheets on which images will be formed and a plurality of sheet outputting units (108 in fig. 1) outputting the sheets on which the image are formed;
- a manipulation panel (104 in fig. 1) including a display unit displaying a print state and
- an input unit input print setting conditions;
- a host computer (col. 8, lines 59-61) inputting the print setting conditions and giving a
- print command to output the work result of a user to the printing device; and
- a printing device controller (i.e., the video controller 103 in fig. 4) including a host interface unit (402 in fig. 4) interfacing the host computer, a manipulation panel interface unit (401 in fig. 4) interfacing the manipulation panel, and a printing device interface unit (406 in fig. 4) interfacing the printing device, the printing device controller processing signals received (col. 8, lines 53-65).

However, as amended, Kakaigi fails to disclose said printing device controller setting an exclusive use for a certain user from a plurality of users with respect to at least one of said sheet outputting position units when instructed.

Exclusive use of the sheet outputting position units is not disclosed in Kakaigi.

Furthermore, Kakaigi fails to disclose the printing device controller setting an exclusive use for a certain user from a plurality of users with respect to at least one of said sheet outputting position units when instructed because for example Kakaigi only mentions selecting a discharge bin as shown in the abstract for example. However, this selection of the discharge bin does not disclose that a certain user of a plurality of users has exclusive control over that discharge bin. For example, in claim 10 of Kakaigi (col. 15, lines 4-12), when the selected sheet stacking means is changed to a newly selected sheet stacking means, the new setting of the changed stacking means is detected and the start of the image on the stacking means is controlled. However, nowhere in the invention of Kakaigi is there an exclusive control of the discharge bin from a plurality of users.

2. As to claim 2, the Examiner stated that Kakigi disclose every feature discussed in claim 1, and further teaches of with display unit (104 in fig. 1) displaying a print state, a name of an exclusive user, and an exclusive user, and an exclusive cassette, the exclusive user being the only user performing a print on the printing device, an exclusive cassette being the sheet storage unit used exclusively by the exclusive user (col. 8, lines 56-58).

Respectfully, Kakigi fails to disclose the limitation of claim 2. The cited section of col. 8, lines 56-58 for example only states that a panel interface 401 receives various settings and instructions by an operator. However, what those various settings are never disclosed. Kakigi fails to disclose for example the display unit displaying a name of an exclusive user and an exclusive cassette. Never is even an exclusive user or exclusive cassette as claimed disclosed in Kakigi.

As mentioned in MPEP §2131, every element must be literally present, arranged as in the

claim.

3. As to claim 3, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses every feature discussed in claim 1, and further teaches with the input unit including a cassette designating unit, a sheet output position designating unit, an exclusive use display column, an exclusive time designating unit, a unit designating a number of print jobs, and a user display panel (col. 8, lines 56-58 and col. 10, lines 10-18).

However, looking closely at col. 8, lines 56-58 and col. 10, lines 10-18 an exclusive use display column and an exclusive time designating unit were never disclosed by Kakigi. As mentioned in MPEP §2131, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim and here the identical invention is not disclosed by Kakigi.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS (35 U.S.C. § 103)

Claims 5-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakigi (US Patent No. 6,422,557) and in combination of Shimura (US Patent No. 6,499,069). The Applicant respectfully traverses.

According to MPEP 706.02(j), the following establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

1. As to claim 5, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses a method for controlling the printing of a printing device controlling system, comprising the steps of:

the printing device controlling system (fig. 1) including the printing device (105 in fig. 1), a manipulating panel (104 in fig. 1), the printing device controller (103 in fig. 4), and a host computer (101 in fig. 1);

setting an exclusive use with respect to a cassette and a sheet outputting position of the printing device under a predetermined set condition, in response to an input from the manipulation panel or the host computer (col. 13, lines 18-23); and

printing specific contents in the cassette and the sheet outputting position of the printing device that are set to be exclusively used, according to a print command from the host computer (col. 13, lines 18-23).

However, Kakigi does not explicitly teach of initializing a printing device controller so that the power is distributed to parts of the printer.

Shimura teaches of turning power on and initializing the controller in the printer (col. 14, line 66 to col. 15, line 14).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the printing system of Kakigi for initializing a printing device controller so that the power is distributed to parts of the printer as taught by Shimura. The suggestion for modifying the system of Kakigi can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth above by Shimura because the modified system would increase the efficiency and reliability of the printer by setting initializing after the power is turned on so that the printer will reset the operation of the units of printer. Such a modification allows the controller of the printer to refresh and restart the communication with the units within the printer.

First of all, setting an exclusive use with respect to a cassette and a sheet outputting position of the printing device under a predetermined set condition, in response to an input from the manipulation panel or the host computer is not disclosed in col. 13, lines 18-23 of Kakigi for example. Col. 13, lines 18-23 on states, "FIG. 10 is a flowchart illustrating a user I/F task for notifying a user of a feeding and discharging system change caused by the reinstruction in accordance with remote control from panel operation and the host computer 101. The user I/F task is executed by the video controller 103." There is no teaching or suggestion of any sort of teaching or suggestion of exclusive use and especially not setting an exclusive use with respect to a cassette and a sheet outputting position of the printing device under a predetermined set condition, in response to an input from the manipulation panel or the host computer as mentioned in the claimed invention. Notifying a user of a feeding and discharge system change does not teach or suggest any sort of exclusive control of the cassette or sheet outputting position.

Secondly, there is also no teaching or suggestion of printing specific contents in the cassette and the sheet outputting position of the printing device that are set to be exclusively used, according

to a print command from the host computer in col. 13, lines 18-23 for example as shown by text of col. 13, lines 18-23 shown above.

2. As to claim 6, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses every feature discussed in claim 5, and further teaches with set condition being a time in the step of setting the exclusive use (step of S605 in fig. 6).

However, looking at figure 6, step S605 asks whether status acquisition can be performed and makes no mention of the limitations of claim 6. On the other hand, looking at the corresponding text in the specification, in col. 10, lines 50-67, a timer being activated is mentioned. However, this timer does not relate to setting exclusive use as claimed in the present invention.

3. As to claim 7, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses every feature discussed in claim 5, and further teaches of set condition being a number of works in the step of setting the exclusive use (step of S611 in fig. 6).

Looking closely at step S611, figure 6 mentions that it is the notification of command retry but no mention of the number of works. The text of the specification does not further elaborate or even mention step S611. Therefore, the number of works is not taught or suggest, nor the number works as related to setting the exclusive use taught or suggested.

4. As to claim 8, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses every feature discussed in claim 5, and further teaches with the step of setting the exclusive use comprising displaying a symbol

signifying the printing device being unusable on the display unit of the manipulation panel when an exclusive user is designated (fig. 10 indicates the input setting symbol is manipulated at the panel).

However, neither figure 10 nor anything else in Kakigi teaches or suggests displaying a symbol signifying the printing device being unusable when the exclusive user is designated. Figure 10 only is disclosing the display of the status change when a bin is moved. However, this does not teach or suggest of symbol for a printing device being unusable when there is an exclusive user selected.

5. As to claim 9, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses every feature discussed in claim 5, and further teaches with the step of setting the exclusive use comprising displaying a symbol representing a next user designation stand by on the display unit of the manipulation panel when the exclusive user is designated (fig. 10 indicates the input setting symbol is manipulated at the panel).

However, looking at figure 10 and its corresponding text in the specification (col. 13, lines 18-43), there is only a mentions that when the discharge bin moving is performed, a LED or LCD indications related to feeding and discharging system are changed as shown in step S1003. However, this does not teach or suggest a symbol representing a next user designation standby when the exclusive user is designated.

6. As to claim 10, the Examiner stated that Kakigi discloses every feature discussed in claim 5, and further teaches the step of canceling the exclusive use setting when a certain period of time elapses after completion of a printing operation set by the exclusive user (step of S605 in fig. 6).

However, looking at step S605, a timer is activated until the controller completely obtains the information. A time being activated does not teach or suggest cancellation of an exclusive use when a certain period of time elapses after completion of printing. Furthermore, no such delay after the printing is taught or suggested.

According to MPEP §706.02(j), “the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.” Clearly here, the combined references fail to teach or suggest *all* of the claim limitations.

7. Concerning the new claims 24 and 25, Kakaigi alone or in combination with Shimura fails to teach or suggest said printing device controller determining whether an exclusive use is to be set with respect to at least one of said sheet outputting position units when said sheet storage unit is set to be exclusively used and determining whether there is a print command when it is determined that the exclusive use is not set with respect to said at least one of said sheet outputting position units or when the corresponding sheet outputting position unit is set to be exclusively used. As mentioned by the Examiner on page 6 of paper no. 4, the prior art fails to disclose such limitations.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. If there are any questions, the examiner is asked to contact the applicant’s attorney.

A fee of \$36.00 is incurred by this Amendment for the addition of two (2) claims above twenty-three (23). Applicant's check drawn to the order of the Commissioner accompanies this Amendment. Should there be a deficiency in payment, or should other fees be incurred, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-4943 of Applicant's undersigned attorney in the amount of such fees.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert E. Bushnell,
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 27,774

1522 "K" Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 408-9040

Folio: P56107
Date: 9/8/04
I.D.: REB/SS